

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS  
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 03/06/2020 02:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Great Oaks Legacy Charter School (S282M200004)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources</b>		
1. Applicant and Resources	40	33
<b>Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	20	15
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	26
<b>Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan</b>		
1. Personnel/Management	10	8
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	82
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>CPP 3: High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	2	1
<b>CPP4: Serve Native American Students</b>		
1. Native American Students	4	0
<b>CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Schools	2	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	1
<b>Total</b>	108	83

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - FY20 CMO - 5: 84.282M

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Great Oaks Legacy Charter School (S282M200004)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources

#### 1. 1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant and Adequacy of Resources

In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 33

#### Sub

1. a. The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments, annual student attendance and retention rates, and, where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State.

#### Strengths:

The applicant provided recent student performance data on state assessment, attendance and retention rates (pp. e 41-42). In addition, the educationally disadvantaged students in the applicant's high school demonstrated a higher graduation rate than the state average of 87% and the other public schools of 81.6% (p. e 45). Great Oaks Legacy Charter School (GOLCS) also had more students enrolled in 4-year college than did the state overall (p. e 48). A hundred percent of students in the applicant's high school participated in ACT comparing to the state average of 24.6% participation, which served as evidence that the applicant placed a great emphasis on the importance of a college preparatory education for all students including educationally disadvantaged students (p. e 45).

#### Weaknesses:

Though the applicant presented the recent student performance data on state assessment, GOLCS student performance were below the state average passing rate across all grades in ELA and Math. For example, in ELA, 9th and 10th graders had 42% and 53% passing rate comparing to the state average of 56% and 59% passing respectively (p. e 38); in Math, 5th, 6th, and 7th grades had 30% , 26%, and 36% passing rate comparing to the state average of 47%, 41%, and 42% passing respectively (p. e 37). These data were not dis-aggregated to demonstrate the performance of educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant.

Annual student attendance and retention rates were provided but not dis-aggregated to demonstrate the performance of subgroups. In addition, neither state average nor other public schools' attendance and retention data were evident for comparison (p. e 41-42).

Though the GOLCS's Student Growth Percentile (SGP) presented for ELA and Math across all campuses, data revealed inconsistency in SGP (p. e 43). In addition, GOLCS high school students had much lower Benchmark percentage on ACT and SAT comparing to the State Benchmark percentage (p. e 46).

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

2. **b. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly stated that no charter school has closed or been revoked including for noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements, nor has it had affiliation revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation (pp. e 49-50). Further, GOLCS obtained state approval receiving the five-year renewed charter term based on the state's comprehensive review of student performance on statewide assessments, operational stability, fiscal viability, public comment, etc. (p. e 50).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

3. **c. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly stated that it has not had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety that could lead to revocation of the school's charter (p. e 50). The Comprehensive Annual Financial report for FY 2019 (p. e 212) and the most recent independent audit report (p. e 229) were evident meeting its responsibility for sound financial management (p. e 51).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

4. **d. The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant intended to use per-pupil dollars as the foundation of ongoing and future support after the Federal funding ends (p. e 51). Thus, the applicant plans not to rely on philanthropic fundraising to sustain its operations. The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for FY 2019 (p. e 212) also indicated the total assets in excess of total liabilities (pp. e 51-52) demonstrating financial stability.

**Weaknesses:**

Per the applicant's Management's Discussion and Analysis report, the total Net Position decreased in FY 2019 comparing to FY 2018. The applicant did not explain the cause of such decrease.

Reader's Score: 9

**Selection Criteria - Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students**

## 1. 2. Significance of Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

The Secretary considers the significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students for the proposed project. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. 1. The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools or, in the case of virtual charter schools, at rates comparable to public schools in the State.

### Strengths:

The applicant presented data demonstrating that the existing charter schools operated by the applicant serve a higher rate of educationally disadvantaged students comparing to the state average; at rates comparable to most of other surrounding public schools (p. e 39). In addition, the applicant currently serves students with disabilities and English learners at rates comparable to most of surrounding public schools (p. e 39).

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. 2. The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.

### Strengths:

The applicant highlighted its marketing plan through word-of-mouth, mailing, billboards, and school choice fairs (p. e 54). The applicant demonstrated its commitment to comply with the Individuals with Disability Education Act providing special education services to eligible students (p. e 55) by modifying and adapting instructional materials. The applicant proposed other strategies to continue serving high-need students such as conducting proactive parent phone calls that engage families and reduce mobility, printing all recruitment materials in English and Spanish (p. e 57).

### Weaknesses:

The applicant provided a basic marketing plan to recruit students. The plan is general not necessarily targeting educationally disadvantaged students in the communities where the new schools would locate. The applicant did not provide any specific strategies to recruit and enroll students with disabilities and English learners (EL) especially the enrollment of ELs in current GOLCS is much lower than the state average and its surrounding public schools (p. e 39). In addition, no instructional strategies were proposed to better serve English learners.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan

#### 1. 3. Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan for the Proposed Project

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 26

Sub

#### 1. 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

##### Strengths:

The applicant proposed an evidence-based conceptual framework using curriculum developed by Achievement First and Uncommon Schools, combined with blended learning technology (p. e 60). In addition, the applicant adopted research based curriculum demonstrating academic gains as evidenced by research findings (pp. e61-62). As an example, i-Ready is a promising intervention supported by at least one correlational study that controls for selection bias. The research conducted in 2017-18 showed that students receiving i-Ready Instruction demonstrated greater gains on the spring i-Ready Diagnostic than student who did not receive i-Ready Instruction (p. e 61).

##### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

#### 2. 2. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the proposed project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.

##### Strengths:

The applicant proposed a logic model clearly listing inputs, activities, outputs, and short- and long-term results (p. e 59). The mixed methods of evaluation would generate qualitative and quantitative data through multiple data sources (p. e 62). Examples of data included teachers' satisfaction with school environment, teacher retention rate, year-over-year student persistence rate, MAP growth norms for ELA and Math, etc. (p. e 59). The proposed performance measures are clearly aligned with the intended outcomes, such as "at least 93% of all GOLCS high school seniors will graduate from high school" (p. e 64).

##### Weaknesses:

Though logic model elements were clearly listed, there was a disconnect between components listed in Resources/Inputs and CSP Activities. For example, no components listed as input would support the activity of "Conduct comprehensive, independent, third-party evaluation over the 5-year CSP funding period" (p. e 59). CSP Activities were proposed as stand-alone components that had no relations to the components in Inputs and/or Outputs in the logic model.

Sub

Reader's Score: 8

- 3. 3. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposed the goals, objectives, and outcomes that are clearly specified and measurable (p. e 63). For example, goals were presented as “at least 95% student attendance”, “at least 80% of students will reach their MAP growth norms for ELA and Math”, etc. (p. e 63), that were realistic and achievable.

**Weaknesses:**

Though the goals proposed were clear and specific, they were not time bond. For example, “at least 80% of students will reach their MAP growth norms for ELA and Math”, the time frame was not clear when the goal would be achieved.

Reader's Score: 3

- 4. 4. The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presented an evaluation team to collect, analyze, and synthesize data to inform continuous improvement efforts. Metrics and analysis were proposed to measure performance using descriptive statistics and qualitative analysis on data collected from internal records, teacher and parent surveys, state assessments etc. (p. e 64). Teacher survey data and focus-group interview data would be collected to assess their satisfaction with the school environment with regards to promoting an efficient and supportive environment (p. e 65). In addition, the parent survey would be used as part of the continuous improvement process measuring parent satisfaction, an indicator of student retention (p. e 66). Interim reports would be provided to project leaders who seek to make adjustments to the strategies and activities funded by the grant (p. e 63). The evaluation team would review the logic model annually with the leaders to discuss progress made to inform planning for the following year (p. e 66). The evaluation findings would be shared annually at conferences and meeting with other charter networks and traditional public schools (p. e 69).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan**

- 1. 4. Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan**

**The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

**In addition, the Secretary considers:**

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Sub**

**1. 1. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presented a team consisting of individuals with extensive experience in operating charter schools. Personnel include the Executive Director, Chief People Officer, Chief Academic Officer, Chief Financial Officer, etc. demonstrating a wealth of knowledge and skills in launching and operating charter schools (p. e 73). Resumes of the key personnel and leadership biographies were evident (pp. e 85-105).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant proposed to hire a Director of STEM Curriculum and Instruction, a Director of Humanities Curriculum and Instruction, and a Network Director of Special Education (pp. e 73-74). As the applicant identified that these key personnel would support teachers to improve student growth and achievement, yet their job descriptions and qualifications were not presented to highlight their responsibilities.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**2. 2. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposed a detailed plan consisting of major project activities, milestones, personal responsible, and timeline (pp. e77-78). The applicant proposed to contract an evaluation team utilizing a mixed-methods approach to produce quantitative and qualitative data ensuring feedback and continuous improvement (p. e 62). In addition, the evaluation team would use a Quasi-Experimental Design to assess whether the CSP grant results in improved student outcomes (p. e 62). Student attendance and persistence, student FAFSA completion, high school graduation rates would be reviewed annually as well as student achievement data. A climate survey would be administered to teachers and staff twice a year to assess satisfaction with the school environment. Focus group interviews with teachers and staff would be conducted annually to gain an in-depth perspective on their experience in the school. Parent survey would be conducted annually via mobile phone, online, and paper surveys as well as parent focus group interviews. In addition, student performance data would be collected and analyzed on a regular basis to measure the progress of the project (pp. e 62-66).

**Weaknesses:**

The plan of evaluating teachers and staff was not evident. Teacher evaluation plays a critical role so that the accountability is in place.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - CPP 3: High School Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: High School Students**

**To receive points under this priority, an applicant must propose to --**



- a. Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;
- b. Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;
- c. Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and
- d. Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

**Note:** For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA), and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposed to replicate and open a high school creating 162 new seats, which is 12.5% of the total new seats offered through this project (p. e 23). The applicant presented a detailed plan to educate all students regardless of their socio-economic or academic background (p. e 31), such as offering daily tutoring sessions and Saturday intervention to every middle and high school students who are in needs (p. e 31). In addition, the applicant highlighted that every Great Oak Legacy Charter School (GOLCS) high school students would take Advanced Placement (AP) courses and ACT/SAT college entrance exam (p. e 32). The applicant proposed four performance measures that would provide valid and reliable information about the progress towards their goal, for example, "At least 93% of all GOLCS high school seniors will graduate from high school" (p. e 34).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant proposed that the new seats created through this project were less than 50%. Though the applicant stated that every student would take AP courses and entrance exam, it lacked further explanations of how blended learning technology, tutoring, and interventions would prepare students to take college admission tests (p. e 31). The applicant failed to address how to provide support for students after their high school graduation in ongoing assistance in financial aid application process, peer support systems, etc. (p.e34).

**Reader's Score:** 1

## Competitive Preference Priority - CPP4: Serve Native American Students

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Opening a New Charter School or Replicating or Expanding a High-quality Charter School to Serve Native American Students

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Propose to open a new charter school, or replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that—

1. Utilizes targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;

2. Has a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

3. Has or will have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Native American organizations located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school;

b. Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Native American organization located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school; and

c. Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Native American organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.

#### Strengths:

No strengths were noted.

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

## Competitive Preference Priority - CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 5: Reopening Academically Poor-Performing Schools as Charter Schools.

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; and

b. Propose to use grant funds under this program to restart one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by—

1. Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and

2. Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools

**Strengths:**

No strengths were noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this priority.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   03/06/2020 02:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 03/06/2020 05:04 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Great Oaks Legacy Charter School (S282M200004)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources</b>		
1. Applicant and Resources	40	34
<b>Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	20	15
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan</b>		
1. Personnel/Management	10	8
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	82
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>CPP 3: High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	2	1
<b>CPP4: Serve Native American Students</b>		
1. Native American Students	4	0
<b>CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Schools	2	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	1
<b>Total</b>	108	83

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - FY20 CMO - 5: 84.282M

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Great Oaks Legacy Charter School (S282M200004)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources

#### 1. 1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant and Adequacy of Resources

In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 34

#### Sub

1. a. The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments, annual student attendance and retention rates, and, where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State.

#### Strengths:

The grantee provides detailed academic achievement data (pages e35-e38, e43-e47, and e154-e211). Data show strong academic performance for some students. While grade level performance from year to year shows some fluctuations, cohort performance shows more consistent growth. For example, for LMS test performance for ELA07 dips in 2018 to 42% from 57% in 2017 and is 45% in 2019 (page e35). When viewing the cohort performance, ELA05 students in 2017 are at 37%, these students are at 39% in 2018 (ELA06), and 45% in 2019 (ELA07) show an increase in student performance. Comparisons with district and state are provided by subgroup. Nearly all of the students served by the grantee are Black or Hispanic (89.9% and 9.7% respectively). Grantee reports 100% participation on SAT exam. Grantee provides four years of academic performance data.

#### Weaknesses:

The grantee states they will strive to raise the bar and close the achievement gap in all subject areas, but specific achievement data are not presented (page e33, e35-e38, e43-e47, and e154-e211). It is unclear if the achievement gap is closing. Attendance rates are not broken out by subgroups.

Reader's Score: 6

2. b. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The grantee clearly states it has not had a charter closed or revoked for any reason including for noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements (page e49-e50). The grantee clearly states their plan to assist families in enrolling in another school should a closure occur. A list of schools operated by the grantee and their locations is provided (e133-e139). The grantee received an initial charter for 4 years and was granted a new 5 year term beginning July 1, 2016 (page e220). The audited financial statement supports the current existence of the charter schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 3. c. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.**

**Strengths:**

The grantee reports that it has a history of strong financial and operational management (page e50-e51, e213-e361). The grantee states it has never failed an audit. It further states it has complied with all applicable national, state, and local educational, operational, and safety statues and regulations (page e50). The grantee provides a summary of their financial position that aligns with information provided in appendix G including a general fund surplus of nearly [REDACTED]. Financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2019 that was submitted to the New Jersey Department of Education Commissioner was included (pages e213-e361). SY2018-19 is the school's eighth year of operation. An independent audit was conducted by a licensed CPA according to standard audit procedures. The auditor did not identify any deficiencies in internal controls over compliance that were considered to be of material weakness (page e351).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 4. d. The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.**

**Strengths:**

The foundation of their financial position is based on operating within their per pupil allocation (page e51) and their financial position shows they have been successful so far. They state they do not rely on philanthropic fundraising or grant writing to sustain its operations or programming. As of June 30, 2019 their total assets exceed their liabilities (page e238). The financial statements show total assets [REDACTED] indicating a healthy surplus net financial position of \$ [REDACTED] for FY2019. The grantee saw an increase in their revenue for FY2019 that was due to increased enrollment.

**Weaknesses:**

The financial statement shows surplus of \$ [REDACTED] million for FY2019 (page e238), which is \$ [REDACTED] million less than for FY2018. It is unclear what caused the decrease in their surplus and whether a similar decrease is anticipated in future years. The grantee does not include budgets beyond the grant period. Budgets for the 5 grant years (2020-21 thru 2024-25) only show use for grant funds. It is unclear how the grantee intends to pay for the salaries and benefits for the four additional staff positions after the grant ends.

Sub

Reader's Score: 8

### Selection Criteria - Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students

#### 1. 2. Significance of Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

The Secretary considers the significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students for the proposed project. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

#### 1. 1. The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools or, in the case of virtual charter schools, at rates comparable to public schools in the State.

##### Strengths:

Compared to the district and state, the grantee is serving a higher percentage of Black and low-income students (page e25, e39). Grantee's student population is 89.9% Black and 86% low-income compared to 39.7% Black and 82.2% low-income for district. The state is 15.6% Black and 37.4% low-income. Although below the district and state, 12% of students served by grantee have disabilities and 4% are identified as English Learners (EL). All students benefit from longer school days that includes 2 hours of tutoring; after school, weekend and summer interventions; increased threshold for passing courses; Advanced Placement courses in high school; and increased pay for teachers (page e19). The grantee uses a variety of tools such as the MAP assessment in literacy and Achievement Network Assessments to identify struggling students and provide additional support (page e31). Another diagnostic used is i-Ready, which is administered three times each year and students use to practice online for English Language Arts and Math standardized assessments (page e32). Retention rate is 94% (p e42). Grantee's high school graduation rate is 91.1% overall. For economically disadvantaged students the rate is 96.4%. This is more than 9 percentage points higher than for the state and nearly 15 percentage points higher than for the district. Charter students take the ACT and SAT at higher rates than across the state (page e45). College attendance rates at 4 year institutions is higher than for the state by over 20 percentage points (page e48). The grantee discusses their use of inclusive and heterogeneous education model to address needs of economically disadvantaged and EL students (e55). They use a variety of methods to address individual student needs including whole class strategies, small group instruction, as well as modifying and adapting instructional content. Grantee outperforms district across grades on state assessments (pages e31-e49, e155-e211).

##### Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 10

#### 2. 2. The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged

**Sub**

**students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

**Strengths:**

The grantee provides some information on their recruitment efforts (page e54, e57). The grantee utilizes the social networks of current families as well as traditional means for recruitment such as blanket mailings to targeted zip codes (page e57, e222), word-of-mouth, billboards, and school fairs. The plan includes enrollment targets (page e22).

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear who is carrying out recruitment beyond encouraging current families to use their personal networks. A timeline for recruitment is not included. Although materials are printed in Spanish it is unclear what other efforts are undertaken to attract English Learners. There are no details on recruiting students with disabilities. The grantee notes that they under enroll students from the neediest populations and cites the Rutgers study finding that 65% of NJ families know little or nothing about charter schools (page e222). A plan for addressing this issue is unclear.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan**

**1. 3. Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan for the Proposed Project**

**The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Sub**

**1. 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

The overarching objective is to expand and replicate the number of charter schools and increase the number of students who receive a college preparatory education to all students regardless of socio-economic or academic background (e15, e18, e31, e59-e61). This is achieved through providing an evidence-based core curriculum, additional opportunities for learning (longer school days, daily tutoring, after school and Saturday interventions, AP and college courses), and strong leadership and financial support. The model is supported at least in part by research that is related to curriculum and instruction (pages e60-e61).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**2. 2. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the proposed project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.**



**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The logic model includes: resources and inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and long-term goals (page e59). The grantee has partnered with a well-respected external evaluator (page e62). The performance measures are objective, measurable and clearly related to the intended outcomes (page e63-e64). The grantee plans to use a quasi-experimental design to assess whether student outcomes for the grant are improved relative to comparable traditional public schools in the district (page e62). The evaluation will collect both quantitative and qualitative data.

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear how some activities influence the outputs and outcomes. For example, it is unclear how the administration of the organizational health survey is used to achieve the outputs (increased number of seats, 4 additional staff) or outcomes (attendance, retention, satisfaction, academic performance, graduation, college enrollment) (page e59). It is unclear how the grantee or their evaluator will obtain student level data for non-charter school students to conduct the comparative analyses needed for the quasi-experimental design component. For the performance measure "Average teacher rates GOLCS school 4 out of 5 on satisfaction with school environment" it is unclear what is meant by "average teacher rates". Performance measures showing SAT/ACT participation and performance or AP course enrollment and performance are not included.

**Reader's Score: 6**

**3. 3. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Strengths:**

The grantee's goals and objectives are clearly identified and most are measurable (page e63-e64). The grantee identifies 4 key objectives: increasing the number of high quality seats; outperforming district students on state assessments; providing support so students graduate high school and enroll, persist and graduate college; and operating schools solely on public funds.

**Weaknesses:**

The grantee has not included a performance measure related to its goal of increasing the number of high-quality seats in the schools it operates (page e63-e64). It is unclear how the grantee is defining high quality and whether all current seats meet the criteria. The timeline for achieving the targets is unclear.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**4. 4. The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.**

**Strengths:**

The evaluation includes a formative evaluation component (pages e67-e69). The evaluation team will meet monthly with grantee leadership, as part of the continuous improvement plan, to discuss progress toward meeting objectives and performance measures. Discussions and plan of action to address any challenges will be documented. A process for follow-up on actions is discussed. Status updates on resolving challenges would be part of the monthly meeting cycle. Results of formative evaluation will be shared with key stakeholders. An annual report will document success, challenges and lessons learned as well as report on outcomes (page e69). Materials suitable for wider dissemination are discussed.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan**

**1. 4. Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan**

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

In addition, the Secretary considers:

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Sub**

**1. 1. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Strengths:**

Current key project staff have the training, experience and skills necessary to manage the grant and charter schools. Resumes are provided for key staff (pages e85-e105). For example, chief academic officer is a former math teacher and former director of Kumon After School Math and Reading Center. She holds a BS in Economics, MA in math education, and an MEd and EdD in Educational Leadership.

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not include job descriptions with qualifications necessary for the 3 of the 4 new positions identified in the narrative: Director of STEM Curriculum and Instruction; Director of Humanities Curriculum and Instruction; and Director of Special Education (pages e73-e74).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**2. 2. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The application includes information about the data they plan to use and how they will obtain or collect the data (page e63-e66). For example, the evaluation team will administer a climate survey to teachers and staff twice each year to assess satisfaction with the school environment. The grantee outlines the major project management activities, responsible member, and timeline (page e76-e78). The grantee plans to review data monthly with the evaluation team and discuss changes or corrections necessary (pages e66-e67). They plan an ongoing review of the logic model to ensure fidelity in implementing their plan and meeting their goals.

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

The grantee does not discuss how they will evaluate faculty (pages e63-e78).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - CPP 3: High School Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: High School Students**

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must propose to --

- a. Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;
- b. Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;
- c. Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and
- d. Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

**Note:** For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA), and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

**Strengths:**

- a. The grantee plans to replicate 4 schools (2 elementary, 1 middle, 1 high) and expand 2 of 5 existing schools (1 elementary, 1 middle). Student population is educationally disadvantaged with 99.6% Black or Hispanic and 86% low-income. These percentages exceed the district and state. Among high school students, 80.5% are low-income, 17.4% have individualized education plans (IEPs), and 4% are English Learners (page e30).
- b. All high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students, receive college prep curriculum that includes Advanced Placement (AP) courses and opportunity to enroll in college course during their senior year. 100% of students take the ACT or SAT college entrance exams (pages e18-e19, e31-e32). The program includes after school and Saturday institutes.

c. Many supports are provided to high school students preparing to graduate from high school and enroll in college including tutoring, FAFSA completion, assistance identifying best college match, and college application support (page e32-e34).

d. Four performance measures are identified that will provide valid and reliable information about progress in preparing students for enrollment in postsecondary education (page e34, e63-e64).

**Weaknesses:**

a. Only 1 of the planned replications and expansions is a high school.

b. No weaknesses found.

c. It is unclear what supports are provided to students once they enroll in college (page e30-e34, e63-e64).

d. No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:** 1

**Competitive Preference Priority - CPP4: Serve Native American Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Opening a New Charter School or Replicating or Expanding a High-quality Charter School to Serve Native American Students**

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

**a. Propose to open a new charter school, or replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that—**

**1. Utilizes targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;**

**2. Has a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and**

**3. Has or will have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Native American organizations located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school;**

**b. Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Native American organization located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school; and**

**c. Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Native American organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.**

**Strengths:**

Applicant did not address this CPP.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant did not address this CPP.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 5: Reopening Academically Poor-Performing Schools as Charter Schools.**

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; and

b. Propose to use grant funds under this program to restart one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by—

1. Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and

2. Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools

**Strengths:**

Applicant did not address this CPP.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant did not address this CPP.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 03/06/2020 05:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 03/06/2020 05:36 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Great Oaks Legacy Charter School (S282M200004)

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources</b>		
1. Applicant and Resources	40	34
<b>Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	20	15
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	24
<b>Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan</b>		
1. Personnel/Management	10	8
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	81
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>CPP 3: High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	2	1
<b>CPP4: Serve Native American Students</b>		
1. Native American Students	4	0
<b>CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Schools	2	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	1
<b>Total</b>	108	82

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - FY20 CMO - 5: 84.282M

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Great Oaks Legacy Charter School (S282M200004)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources

#### 1. 1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant and Adequacy of Resources

In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 34

#### Sub

1. a. The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments, annual student attendance and retention rates, and, where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State.

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides sufficient evidence of academic achievement results in its campuses. Student growth has experienced a positive, upward trend in many grade levels across high stakes subjects of ELA and math. Student performance data is provided from three years, 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019. For example, an upward trend in performance was noted in ELA in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10 with a slight decrease in grades 7, 9 and 11. In the discipline of math, upward trends across the four years of reporting were also realized in grades 3, 4 and held steady, reporting scores with a few points in grades 5 and 7. While Algebra 1 scores were the 40 percent range across the four years, in geometry, scores indicated a strong upward trend. Overall, student growth in math increased by 6 points, ELA increased by 13 points (e35-40). Likely, a frequent assessment cycle has realized this positive growth overall in academic outcomes. The applicant compared favorably to other charter schools, outperforming them overall in terms of passing rates in math and ELA across grade levels, and compared to state scores, outperforms the state in high school ELA. Just one peer charter outperformed the applicant' school in ELA and only two schools outperformed the applicant in math. As well, attendance is considered high, at 91.5% and is within 1/10 of a point compared to the state attendance average (e40). High school graduation rates are at 91%, with the district public schools at 81.6%, and slightly lower than the entire state at 92.4%; economically disadvantaged students graduate at a rate of 96.4% while the district graduates similar students at a rate of 81.6%, and the state at 87% (e45). The applicant also reports a higher rate of participation in advanced coursework, taking 2.7 more AP exams than at the state level (e47). Finally, college attendance was also reported; 80.2% of the applicant's students enroll in post-secondary while only 72.8% do so across the state. Cohort performance indicates growth (e35-48).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

Attendance rates across subgroups were not reported. Both ACT and SAT performance was also reported; all of the applicant's high school students participate in the ACT compared to just 24.6% at the state level but scored below state levels overall. Retention data was not reported uniformly and performance measures indicate inconsistent results across grade levels and across the 4 years of data reported (e35-48).

**Reader's Score: 6**

- 2. b. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides that no schools have experienced a revocation or noncompliance issue. No charter schools have closed due to regulatory or statutory requirements. No voluntary dissolutions were reported by the applicant (e49-50).

**Weaknesses:**

Not noted (e49-50).

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 3. c. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant sufficiently provides that the CMO has never experienced any closures due to operational and/or financial reasons, nor have they been cited or subjected to any revocation or noncompliance issues. The applicant also provides that it has never failed an audit. A healthy general fund balance (surplus) was reported, indicating overall financial well-being (e50-51; e133-139; e212-229; Appendix G).

**Weaknesses:**

Not noted (e50-51; e133-139; e212-229; Appendix G).

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 4. d. The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a history of an adequate plan for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends through a lean financial model. The applicant's proposed plan includes a reliance on per pupil dollars. Through expansion, it is likely this will continue. In addition, a very strong parental/familial support base is evidenced and supported through staffing a full-time parent engagement coordinator (e51-52; e238).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide information regarding how the parents satisfaction surveys are distributed or how parents and family members can gain access to membership in the parent council. No explanation was provided for the difference in fund balance between 2018-2019 and subsequent year; the short-term reduction was not



**Sub**

adequately explained. A budget beyond the life of the grant was not included; thus, it is difficult to ascertain how additional positions allocated through the grant will be sustained. (e51-52); e238.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Selection Criteria - Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students**

**1. 2. Significance of Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students**

**The Secretary considers the significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students for the proposed project. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub**

- 1. 1. The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools or, in the case of virtual charter schools, at rates comparable to public schools in the State.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides ample evidence of serving educationally disadvantaged students. Data reveals that 86% of CMO students were eligible for free and/or reduced lunches compared to the host district at 82.2%, and the state at 37.4%, which is a higher rate. The applicant enrolls 12.0% of students with disabilities; the district has 16.9 % of its students identified as special needs and the state rate is 17.7% (e39; 53; Appendix H).

**Weaknesses:**

Not noted (e39; e53; Appendix H).

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 2. 2. The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

**Strengths:**

Projected enrollment increases are clearly specified in the applicant's plan to replicate and expand through recruitment, enrollment, and by effectively serving educationally disadvantaged students. The proposed plan includes targeted assistance for students with special needs, in keeping with the CMO's mission to provide additional assistance through specialized tutoring. marketing plan to recruit in includes heavy familial involvement, word of mouth is the primary recruitment strategy, multiple methods of application, and recruitment materials printed in two languages. A weighted state per-pupil allotment provides an additional layer of support for students with exceptionalities; all special education personnel must be state certified (e53-59; Appendix H).

**Weaknesses:**

A blind lottery system is not used for enrollment. The applicant uses an application process that includes a three-stage process but nothing in stage one provides any factors for exceptionalities as part of the applicant's proposed

**Sub**

plan. Students identified as English learners are 4.0% for the applicant but the host district enrolls at a higher rate, 17%, and the state at 6.5% which is less than both comparison populations. The marketing plan proposed was very general and lacked specificity. No specific strategies for recruiting students identified as ELLs or eligible for special education services was provided in sufficient detail (e53-59; Appendix H).

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan**

**1. 3. Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan for the Proposed Project**

**The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 24**

**Sub**

**1. 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

An adequate structural framework is described as using a high-quality curriculum combined with blended technologies. Research is adequately provided. As an example, the ALEKS theory is referenced as well as iRead which has also been vetted via rigorous analysis methods. A strong logic model of resources and inputs, outputs, and outcomes, activities, and long-term goals is presented as part of the applicant's proposed plan. Access to college preparation is provided to all students (e60-61).

**Weaknesses:**

Not noted (e60-61).

**Reader's Score: 5**

**2. 2. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the proposed project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

There is sufficient information provided regarding methods of evaluation. A reputable firm, WestEd, will operate as an external evaluator; a mixed methods design is proposed. Both ample quantitative data and qualitative data will be generated. For instance, student performance measures, attendance data, and post-secondary enrollments and attainment percentages will all be measured; likewise, qualitative data such as focus group interviews with teachers and staff as well and climate surveys are all planned. Clearly stated, measurable, objective performance measures are proposed as part of the plan. As an example, at least 58% will meet or exceed state proficiency rates in ELA. In addition, measures are aligned to data source (metric) and analysis method (e62-66).

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear what procedures will be employed to conduct a matched-pair analysis. Average teacher rates were not explained in sufficient detail (e62-66).

Sub

Reader's Score: 6

3. 3. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

**Strengths:**

Performance measures are clearly articulated. For example, the applicant proposes to increase student enrollment by 1296 students and serve a total of 3028 students by 2024-25. Objectives are measurable. Examples include: 91.5% attendance rate; 75% teacher retention rate; 81% of students will reach individual goals; a 90% FAFSA completion rate, and 40% of alumni will obtain a BA in 6 years (e15; 66-67).

**Weaknesses:**

The number of high-quality seats was not well defined or explained in adequate detail. While goals are presented, they are not time-bound, making it difficult to ascertain when they may be achieved within the proposed plan. An adequate timeline for achieving targets is not included as part of the applicant's proposed plan (e66-67).

Reader's Score: 3

4. 4. The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

**Strengths:**

The applicant specifically addressed replication. Implementation and evaluation were discussed in sufficient detail. For instance, within the applicant's proposed plan, working with the applicant's external evaluator, both formative and summative methods of data collection, analysis, and synthesize will occur. These methods such as tracking successes and challenges in written documents and subsequently sharing these results at monthly meetings will result in a coherent record of obstacles encountered and ways of addressing such issues. Tracking student outcomes will also be examined in a systematic way at intervals throughout the academic year. All results will be shared with the evaluation team which in turn, will suggest recommendations to stakeholders at key network meetings. These formative methods coupled with the annual evaluation report will yield rich results that can be used to guide replication of strategies, pedagogical practices, and managerial processes. The evaluation team will create an annual PowerPoint of findings for wide dissemination (e67-69).

**Weaknesses:**

Not noted (e67-69).

Reader's Score: 10

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan**

**1. 4. Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan**

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

In addition, the Secretary considers:

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Sub**

**1. 1. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Strengths:**

Key project personnel possess sufficient experience and expertise, both of which are relevant to the success of the applicant's proposed plan. For example, the executive director has teaching experience, has been a director of development, and had been a dean of students. As well, the project director is the current managing director of strategy and has held several strategy-related positions with another CMO. Other key project personnel are described according to the expertise they bring to the project. A network director of talent position is proposed and job description is provided (e69-76; Appendix B).

**Weaknesses:**

No job descriptions are included for three new proposed positions. For example, while an adequate job description is provided for the proposed position of the director of talent position, the STEM network director, the special education network director, and the humanities network director job descriptions/and or sought after position qualifications are not provided (e69-76; Appendix B).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**2. 2. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

Several procedures were presented as an internal method of ensuring feedback and improvement. The proposed plan suggests that monthly meetings, a reputable external evaluator, and an experienced management team will sufficiently address feedback. In addition, a senior leadership team will be specifically focused on attaining progress toward project goals, objectives, and specified outcomes. Finally, Table 21 contains major management activities and milestones, responsible personnel, and a timeline, indicating sufficient oversight to ensure continuous improvement. Plans to share results were included as part of the applicant's proposed plan such as local conferences, charter conferences, and national conferences (e66-69; e76-78; e81).

**Weaknesses:**

Faculty evaluation was not discussed in sufficient detail. Given that building and maintaining a quality teaching force is a major component of the applicant's proposed plan, this facet of continuous improvement is lacking within the proposed plan (e66-69; e76-78; e81).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - CPP 3: High School Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: High School Students**

**To receive points under this priority, an applicant must propose to --**

- a. Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including**

educationally disadvantaged students;

b. Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;

c. Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and

d. Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

**Note:** For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA), and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

**Strengths:**

a) The applicant clearly states intention to replicate their CMO model to a new high school. Currently, 382 high school students are served (e22-24; e30).

b) The applicant proposes to provide sufficient postsecondary access. Mechanisms for achieving access and success include a small school approach, intensive tutoring, more time, and effective teachers (e18-19; e30-31).

c) The applicant provides for an adequate plan to address support for enrollment in postsecondary pathways and to address attainment of postsecondary education. These include after school and Saturday programming (e30-32).

d) Four quantifiable performance measures are included as a part of the applicant's plan for replication/expansion: 90% will complete a FAFSA, 93% will graduate from high school, 80% will matriculate to college, and 40% will earn a BA in 6 years (e33-34).

**Weaknesses:**

a) Replication or expansion of high-quality charter schools to serve high school student did not meet the established threshold provided. The plan proposes to serve high school students who represent approximately 12% of the expanded school population, below the established threshold (e22-24; e30)

b) Not noted. (e18-19; e30-31)

c) Not noted. (e30-32)

d) Not noted. (e33-34)

**Reader's Score: 1**

**Competitive Preference Priority - CPP4: Serve Native American Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Opening a New Charter School or Replicating or Expanding a High-quality Charter School to Serve Native American Students**

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Propose to open a new charter school, or replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that—

1. Utilizes targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;

2. Has a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

3. Has or will have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Native American organizations located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school;

b. Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Native American organization located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school; and

c. Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Native American organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.

**Strengths:**

- a. 1. Not addressed by applicant.
- 2. Not addressed by applicant.
- 3. b. Not addressed by applicant.
- c. Not addressed by applicant.

**Weaknesses:**

- a. 1. Not addressed by applicant.
- 2. Not addressed by applicant.
- 3. b. Not addressed by applicant.
- c. Not addressed by applicant.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 5: Reopening Academically Poor-Performing Schools as Charter Schools.**

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; and

b. Propose to use grant funds under this program to restart one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by—

1. Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and

2. Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools

**Strengths:**

a) Not noted.

b) Not noted.

1) Not noted.

2) Not noted.

**Weaknesses:**

a) Not noted.

b) Not noted.

1) Not noted.

2) Not noted.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 03/06/2020 05:36 PM